

**PATENT**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re the Patent Application of:

Larren F. Jones, et al.

Appln. No.: 09/368,503

Filed: August 5, 1999

For: Wear Assembly For A Digging  
Edge Of An Excavator

Atty. Docket No.: 051291.81516

Group Art Unit: 3641

Examiner: Christopher J. Novosad

Confirmation No: 5616

**RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION DATED OCTOBER 27, 2009**  
**AND ACCOMPANYING REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Final Office Action mailed October 27, 2008, before the present "RCE" was filed, the applicants request that the Examiner continue examination and reconsider the application in view of the remarks herein. Applicants request any extensions of time necessary for acceptance or entry of this paper. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fees or credit overpayment of fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0733.

No changes to the Abstract, Specification, Claims or Drawings are made in this paper

**Remarks** begin on page 4 of this paper.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW .....	4
II.	REVIEW OF THE PROSECUTION HISTORY AS TO REISSUE OATHS/DECLARATIONS .....	6
	A. THE ORIGINAL DECLARATION .....	6
	B. THE CHANGES/AMENDMENTS MADE TO THE CLAIMS.....	6
	C. PROSECUTION THEREAFTER .....	7
	D. THE REQUIREMENT FOR A SUPPLEMENTAL OATH/DECLARATION.....	7
	E. THE CONTINUATION OF THE REQUIREMENT .....	8
	F. THE FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL AND SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS .....	9
	G. THE OFFICE ACTION DATED OCTOBER 27, 2008.....	9
III.	THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE PATENT STATUTE, CFR AND MPEP .....	9
IV.	THE REQUIREMENT THAT “THE SPECIFIC CHANGES/ AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS MUST [] BE IDENTIFIED IN DETAIL IN THE DECLARATION IN ADDITION TO THE ERRORS IN THE ORIGINAL CLAIMS” IS NOT SUPPORTED IN THE PATENT STATUTE, CFR OR MPEP .....	12
	A. THE APPLICANTS CANNOT LOCATE SUPPORT FOR THE REQUIREMENT IN THE PATENT STATUTE, CFR OR MPEP .....	12
	1. THE APPLICANTS CANNOT LOCATE SUPPORT FOR THE REQUIREMENT IN THE PATENT STATUTE .....	12
	2. THE APPLICANTS CANNOT LOCATE SUPPORT FOR THE REQUIREMENT IN THE CFR .....	13
	3. THE APPLICANTS CANNOT LOCATE SUPPORT FOR THE REQUIREMENT IN THE MPEP .....	14
	B. ROUTINE OFFICE PRACTICE, AS WELL, DOES NOT SUPPORT THE REQUIREMENT .....	17
	C. THE APPLICANTS, CAN, HOWEVER, LOCATE A SOURCE FOR THE REQUIREMENT IF THIS WERE A TIME BEFORE DECEMBER 1, 1997, NOT A TIME IN 2009.....	21
V.	RESPECTFULLY, IN THE ABSENCE OF SUPPORT FOR THE REQUIREMENT THAT “THE SPECIFIC CHANGES/AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS MUST [] BE IDENTIFIED IN DETAIL IN THE DECLARATION IN ADDITION TO THE ERRORS IN THE ORIGINAL CLAIMS,” THE REQUIREMENT SHOULD BE RECONSIDERED .....	27

A.	THE APPLICANTS' ORIGINAL AND FIRST AND SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS SHOULD BE ACCEPTED AS FULLY COMPLIANT WITH THE PATENT STATUTE, CFR AND MPEP .....	28
VI.	APPLICANTS' THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION .....	30
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	32